

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,184	01/29/2001	Raymond John Herbert	4967	7306
26936	7590 06/18/2004		EXAMINER	
SHOEMAKER AND MATTARE, LTD			NGUYEN, ANTHONY H	
	FICE ROAD - SUITE 11 ING, MD 20910	0	ART UNIT	
,			2854	

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	09/770,184	HERBERT, RAYMOND JOHN		
Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit		
	Anthony H Nguyen	2854		
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cov r sheet with the c	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from tte, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30	December 2003	·		
	<u> </u>			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 10-14 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest is/are allowed. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 10-14 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and are subject.	awn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction. 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiration.	ccepted or b) objected to by the lead of a by the lead of the drawing(s) is obtained if the drawing(s) is obtained if the drawing(s) is obtained of the lead of	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documer application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicati onty documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage		
Attachment(s)	n □			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/30/2003. 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	(PTO-413) ate ratent Application (PTO-152)		

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 30, 2003 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Dickey (US 4,813,799) in view of Herring et al. (US 6,065,883).

Dickey teaches a method of using a printer to print on a document 26 comprising the steps of providing a carrier having a recess at a surface to receive the document, mounting the document to the carrier, feeding the carrier with the document past the print head for printing on the document as shown in Figs.1-4. Dickey does not teach clearly the printer having the first and second feeding means. Herring et al. teaches the first and second feeding means 12 and 13

Art Unit: 2854

for feeding an item 20 which is printed by a print head 26 (Herring et al., Fig.2). In view of the teaching of Herring et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Dickey by using the printer as taught by Herring et al. for optimum printing quality on a small size item carried by a carrier. With respect to claim 14, note that the method is the same regardless the kind/type of document to be printed in the printer of Herring et al. Also, note that the use of memory for storing data that prints an image in a printer is conventional.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Dickey in view of Herring et al. as applied to claims 10-12 and 14 above, and further in view of Kuronuma (JP 0139745).

Dickey and Herring et al. teach all that is claimed, except for the carrier having a first sheet element and a second sheet element which includes an aperture. Kuronuma teaches a carrier which comprises a first sheet 5 and a second sheet 7 including an aperture 4 for receiving a card 1 as shown in Figs. 1 and 2 (page 282). In view of the teaching of Kuronuma, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the carrier of Dickey by providing a carrier having a second sheet element having an aperture as taught by Kuronuma for ensuring optimal securing a small document to a carrier for printing.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed on December 30, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2854

Conclusion

The patents to Pierce et al. and Griffin are cited to show other methods having obvious similarities to the claimed method.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-2169. The examiner can normally be reached daily from 9 AM to 5PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld, can be reached on (571) 272-2168. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Anthony Nguyen

6/12/04

Patent Examiner

Eathony Obucjen

Technology Center 2800